		a rev	
1	Kamala D. Harris	assignification of the second	
2	Attorney General of California JAMES M. LEDAKIS	OF CHEMON	
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General CARL W. SONNE	THIS IS WOT A DIECIPLINARY ACTION OF THE BOARD	
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 116253	13 NO R FILL BOANS	
5	110 West "A" Street, Suite 1100 San Diego, CA 92101	TRIME TOOKS OF TRIEF	
6	P.O. Box 85266 San Diego, CA 92186-5266	Mar On	
7	Telephone: (619) 645-3164 Facsimile: (619) 645-2061		
. 8	Attorneys for Complainant		
9	BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY		
10	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
11		1	
12	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. AC-2011-16	
13	DANIEL F. STULAC		
14	4700 Kinzie Avenue Racine, WI 53406	ACCUSATION	
15	Certified Public Accountant Certificate No. 77311		
16	Respondent.		
17			
18	Complainant alleges:		
19	PARTIES		
20	1. Patti Bowers (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity as		
21	the Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer Affairs.		
22	2. On or about April 8, 1999, the California Board of Accountancy (CBA) issued		
23	Certified Public Accountant Certificate Number 77311 to Daniel F. Stulac (Respondent). The		
24	Certified Public Accountant Certificate expired on July 31, 2004, and has not been renewed.		
25	Effective August 1, 2009, the certificate was cancelled pursuant to California Business and		
26	Professions Code section 5070.7 for failure to renew the certificate within five (5) years.		
27			
28		•	

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation is brought before the CBA under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.
 - 4. Section 5063(a)(3) states:
 - (a) A licensee shall report to the board in writing of the occurrence of any of the following events occurring on or after January 1, 1997, within 30 days of the date the licensee has knowledge of these events:
 - (3) The cancellation, revocation, or suspension of the right to practice as a certified public accountant or a public accountant before any governmental body or agency.
 - 5. Section 5100 states:

After notice and hearing the board may revoke, suspend, or refuse to renew any permit or certificate granted under Article 4 (commencing with Section 5070) and Article 5 (commencing with Section 5080), or may censure the holder of that permit or certificate for unprofessional conduct that includes, but is not limited to, one or any combination of the following causes:

- (g) Willful violation of this chapter or any rule or regulation promulgated by the board under the authority granted under this chapter.
- (h) Suspension or revocation of the right to practice before any governmental body or agency.
- "(1) The imposition of any discipline, penalty, or sanction on a registered public accounting firm or any associated person of such firm, or both, or on any other holder of a permit, certificate, license, or other authority to practice in this state, by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board or the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, or their designees under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 or other federal legislation."
- 6. Section 5107(a) of the Code states:

The executive officer of the board may request the administrative law judge, as part of the proposed decision in a disciplinary proceeding, to direct any holder of a permit or certificate found to have committed a violation or violations of this chapter to pay to the board all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees. The board shall not recover costs incurred at the administrative hearing.

7. Section 5109 of the Code states:

The expiration, cancellation, forfeiture, or suspension of a license, practice privilege, or other authority to practice public accountancy by operation of law or by order or decision of the board or a court of law, or the voluntary surrender of a license by a licensee shall not deprive the board of jurisdiction to commence or proceed with any investigation of or action or disciplinary proceeding against the licensee, or to render a decision suspending or revoking the license.

8. Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

FACTS

- 9. On February 26, 2010, the CBA received correspondence from the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), notifying the CBA of Respondent's suspension from appearing or practicing before the SEC as an accountant. The letter stated Respondent consented to the issuance of the SEC's Order Instituting Administrative Proceedings Pursuant to Rule 102(e) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, Making Findings, and Imposing Remedial Sanctions (SEC Order) without admitting or denying the findings therein. The letter also stated the SEC suspended Respondent based on a U.S. District Court's order enjoining him from violating the antifraud and other provisions of the federal securities law.
- 10. Enclosed with the letter were copies of the Order, In the Matter of Daniel F. Stulac; the Order, In the Matter of Berdj J. Rassam, CPA, which is a related but separate matter from Respondent's matter; the Consent of Daniel F. Stulac (Consent); the Final Judgment of Daniel F. Stulac (Judgment); the Complaint, Case No. 04 CV 2002 JAH (RBB) (SEC Complaint); and two SEC Litigation Releases, No. 18205 dated June 30, 2003 and No. 18919 dated October 6, 2004.
 - 11. The SEC Order stated in pertinent part:

Stulac became a partner at Arthur Anderson in September 2000 and was the engagement partner on the audit of Peregrine Systems, Inc. ("Peregrine") from September 2000 to September 2001. At the time Stulac was the engagement partner on the audit, Peregrine was a Delaware corporation with principal offices in San

Diego, California. Peregrine's primary business involved selling infrastructure management software. From its initial public offering in April 1997, until it merged with Hewlett-Packard in 2005, Peregrine's common stock was registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act"). It traded on the Nasdaq National Market System from its initial public offering until August 30, 2002, when it was delisted and quoted on the Pink Sheets. In February 2003, Peregrine announced the restatement of \$509 million of revenue it had improperly recorded.

On September 14, 2009, a final judgment was entered against Stulac, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, and from aiding and abetting violations of Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 thereunder, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Stephen P. Gardner, et al., Civil Action No. 04 CV 2002 (S.D. Cal.).

The Commission's Complaint alleged, among other things, that Peregrine and its senior officers fraudulently inflated the revenues Peregrine reported in its filings with the Commission and elsewhere. Peregrine improperly recorded millions of dollars of revenue based on non-binding arrangements with resellers. This ultimately caused uncollectible receivables from the non-binding arrangements to swell on Peregrine's balance sheet. The Complaint further alleged that Peregrine's management improperly wrote off unpaid receivables by falsely characterizing the write-offs as "acquisition costs and other." According to the Commission's Complaint, Stulac knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that the receivables Peregrine intended to write off were unrelated to acquisitions and should not have been recorded as "acquisition costs and other." The Complaint also alleged Stulac knew, or was reckless in not knowing, that Peregrine's 2001 financial statements improperly recognized millions of dollars of revenue from agreements with resellers. The Complaint alleged that, by engaging in this and other conduct, Stulac violated

anti-fraud provisions of the Exchange Act, and aided and abetted violations of the reporting provisions of the Exchange Act.

In view of the foregoing, the Commission deems it appropriate to impose the sanction agreed to in [Mr. Stulac's] Offer.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED, effective immediately, that:

[Respondent] is suspended from appearing or practicing before the Commission as an accountant.

After five (5) years from the date of this order, [Mr. Stulac] may request that the Commission consider reinstatement by submitting an application ... to resume appearing or practicing before the Commission...

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Discipline by SEC)

12. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 5100(1) of the code in that:
(i) on September 14, 2009, a final judgment was entered against Stulac, permanently enjoining him from future violations of Sections 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5 thereunder, and from aiding and abetting violations of Section 13(a) of the Exchange Act and Rules 13a-1 and 13a-13 thereunder, in the civil action entitled Securities and Exchange Commission v. Stephen P. Gardner, et al., Civil Action No. 04 CV 2002 (S.D. Cal.); and (ii) on or about September 18, 2009, in SEC Release No. 60693 and Accounting and Auditing Enforcement Release 3054 / Administrative Proceeding File No. 3-13619, the SEC suspended Respondent's right to appear or practice before that body. The circumstances leading to Respondent's suspension are set forth in paragraphs 9 to 11, above.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Discipline by Governmental Agency)

13. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 5100(h) of the code in that on or about September 18, 2009 a governmental body or agency suspended Respondent's right to practice before that governmental body or agency following a judgment against Respondent by

1	that governmental agency on or about September 14, 2009. The circumstances are described in		
2	paragraphs 9 to 12, above.		
3	THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE		
4	(Failure to Report Suspension)		
5	14. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 5100(g) and 5063(a)(3) of		
6	the code in that Respondent failed to report to the CBA his September 18, 2009 suspension as an		
7	accountant by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission to the CBA within 30 days		
8	of notice thereof.		
9	PRAYER		
10	WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged,		
11	and that following the hearing, the California Board of Accountancy issue a decision:		
12	1. Revoking or suspending or otherwise imposing discipline upon Certified Public		
13	Accountant Certificate Number 77311 issued to Daniel F. Stulac;		
14	2. Ordering Daniel F. Stulac to pay the California Board of Accountancy the reasonable		
15	costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions		
16	Code section 5107;		
17	3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.		
18			
19	DATED Amist 26 2011 Salt Bridge		
20	PATTY BOWERS Executive Officer		
21	California Board of Accountancy Department of Consumer Affairs		
22	State of Collision Consumer Arrans State of California Complainant		
23	Сотринин		
24	SD2011800326 80536961.doc		
25	00330701,400		
26			
27			
28			